



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,484	03/30/2001	Jay H. Connelly	42390P10858	5737

8791 7590 09/10/2007
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

ALAM, MUSHFIKH I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/10/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/823,484	Applicant(s) CONNELLY, JAY H.	
	Examiner Mushfikh Alam	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues with respect to claim 1, Brunheroto fails to teach that such web server 106 broadcasts a data file that is to be broadcast by TV broadcast station 112, as in Claim 1. Rather than broadcast at least one data file that is to be subsequently broadcast by a broadcast server of a broadcast service system, as in Claim 1, the web server referred to by the Examiner does not broadcast content but in fact is used to track audience viewing of the interactive content provided to the broadcast station for broadcast via broadcast network 113 which is shown as block 305 in FIG. 3, with tracking server 307 corresponding to web server 106 as shown in FIG. 1.

In response to Applicant's argument, it is noted that reference Brunheroto is relied upon to teach the limitation "a broadcast server of a broadcast service system that is separate from the service provider system." Seidman is relied upon to teach the limitation "broadcasting meta-data to one or more client system including descriptions of a plurality of available for broadcast data files from a broadcast server of a service provider system and a plurality of upcoming data files to be broadcast to the one or more client system by a broadcast server of a broadcast service system" as shown in claim 1.

Applicant further argues with respect to claim 1, that pre-stored commercials, as taught by Hite, would refer to commercials that are not to be broadcast at a set time according to, for example, a thirty second commercial spot during which Hite teaches that a number of commercials might be broadcast simultaneously over different separate channels. In fact, we submit that such pre-stored commercials are used for situations where time synchronization of several channels of alternate commercials is not possible without causing conflicts with normally scheduled pre-emptable commercials. Hence, although such commercial is broadcast prior to a commercial spot, we submit that such pre-stored commercials are not subsequently broadcast to a user as such additional broadcast of the pre-stored commercials would be a waste of broadcast bandwidth.

In response to Applicant's argument that the commercial are not subsequently broadcast to a user as additional broadcast, reading the claim in the broadest sense Hite teaches the limitation "at least one upcoming data file for selective storage within the one ore more client systems according to respective content rating tables of the one or more client systems prior to broadcast of at least one upcoming data files by the broadcast service system" as claimed in claim 1. In a situation where it may not be possible to time synchronize the channels the targeted ads can be substituted during live events. Pre-stored commercials will be broadcast to the user in the event that the time synchronization is not possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4, 15-18, 25-26, 34, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman et al. (US 6298482) in view of Brunheroto et al. (US 2002/0087969) and further in view of Hite et al. (US 6002393).

Claim 1, Seidman discloses a method, comprising:

- broadcasting meta-data to one or more client systems (Col. 7, lines 34-40, Col. 8, lines 16-35), including descriptions of a plurality of available for broadcast data files from a broadcast server of a service provider system and a plurality of upcoming data files to be broadcast to the one or more client system by a broadcast server of a broadcast service system (Col. 5, lines 13-32; Col. 7, lines 39- 55, data describing programming data, Col. 9, lines 20-40, plurality of program segments for viewing);
- rating the plurality of available for broadcast data files and the plurality of upcoming data files (Col. 6, lines 25-52; Col. 7, lines 63-67; Col. 8, lines 1-11, user ratings and profile of different shows); and
- broadcasting, by the broadcast server of the service provider system according to the rating a plurality of data files to enable a user to navigate the concurrently transmitted customized digital stream (Col. 3, lines 55-67; Col. 8, lines 20-50; Col. 9, lines 45-67; Col. 10, lines 1-6).

Seidman does not clearly disclose "a broadcast server of a broadcast service system that is separate from the service provider system" and "at least upcoming data file for selective storage within the one or more client systems according to respective content rating tables of the one or more client systems prior to broadcast of at least one of upcoming data files by the broadcast server of the broadcast service system".

Brunheroto discloses an architecture of an interactive TV audience estimation and program rating in which a global tracking unit 107 is linked to a Web server 106 (Service provider system) is separate from the Interactive TV content creation 111 and the TV broadcast station 112 (a broadcast server of a broadcast service system), as shown in Fig. 1.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman with Brunheroto's interactive TV tracking architecture so that global tracking unit 107 able to determine how many people are enjoying the enhanced TV mode and showing interest in some products, even purchasing these products on the TV screen on a real-time basis based on the hyperlinked activity which is concurrent with viewer interests on the video presentation (see page 3, §0027).

Hite discloses disclose "at least one upcoming data file for selective storage within the one ore more client systems according to respective content rating tables of the one or more client systems prior to broadcast of at least one upcoming data files by the broadcast service system" (Col. 12, lines 13-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman in view of Brunheroto to record at least one TV program, i.e., targeting commercials, on the user receiver, as taught by Brown so the targeted commercials are available at the moment needed without concern for the timing on the other channels (see Col. 12, lines 25-28).

Regarding Claim 4, Seidman shows that a variety of hyperlinks are sent to the user then the user selects the hyperlink, effectively sending the meta-data (col. 7 lines 28-38, col. 8 lines 19-45, selection of hyperlink sends user relevant metadata, hyperlink is effectively scheduling the display of data).

Claim 15, the apparatus claim is analyzed with respect to the method claim 1 in which limitations "a processor, a communication interface and storage device" are met by Seidman in view of Brunheroto (Fig. 1 and 2) and Hite so to perform as disclosed.

Claim 16, Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Hite (Fig. 5; Col. 11, lines 45- Col. 12, lines 28) further shows selecting data files from the plurality of upcoming and available for broadcast data files which have higher ratings based on the received ratings.

Claim 17, Seidman (Col. 6, lines 40-67) in view of Brunheroto and Hite further shows

- receiving rating of the plurality of available for broadcast data files and the plurality of upcoming data files from the one or more client systems;
- Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Hite (Fig. 5; Col. 11, lines 45-Col. 12, lines 28) further shows selecting data files from the plurality of upcoming and available for broadcast data files which have higher ratings based on the received ratings;
- Seidman (Col. 9, lines 20-45, 57-67; Col 10, lines 1-20, overlapping segments) further shows determining overlapping data files as data files from the selected data files to be broadcast by the broadcast service system; and
- Seidman (Col. 9, lines 10-55, displaying the program segment most relative to user interest and suppressing additional segments) further shows eliminating, from the selected data files, the overlapping data files to form a subset of the plurality of available for broadcast data files to be broadcast to the one or more client systems by the service provider.

Claim 18, Seidman (Col. 5, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 65-67; Col. 9, lines 45- 67; Col. 10, lines 1-6) in view of Brunheroto (Fig. 1 and 2) and Hite discloses broadcast schedule of the subset of the plurality of available data files prior to broadcasting the subset of the plurality of available for broadcast data files.

Claim 25, a machine-readable medium having instruction stored thereon, which when executed by a processor is analyzed with respect to method claim 1.

Claim 26, Seidman (Col. 6, lines 40-67) in view of Brunheroto and Hite further shows

- receiving rating of the plurality of available for broadcast data files and the plurality of upcoming data files from the one or more client systems;

- Seidman in View of Brunheroto and Hite (Fig. 5; Col. 11, lines 45-Col. 12, lines 28) further shows selecting data files from the plurality of upcoming and available for broadcast data files which have higher ratings based on the received ratings;
- Seidman (Col. 9, lines 20-45, 57-67; Col 10, lines 1-20, overlapping segments) further shows determining overlapping data files as data files from the selected data files to be broadcast by the broadcast service system; and
- Seidman (Col. 9, lines 10-55, displaying the program segment most relative to user interest and suppressing additional segments) further shows eliminating, from the selected data files, the overlapping data files to form a subset of the plurality of available for broadcast data files to be broadcast to the one or more client systems by the service provider.

Claim 34 is analyzed with respect to claims 1 and 4 in which Seidman further shows

- a service provider broadcast server (col. 4 lines 30-40, head end with media content), and
- one or more client systems coupled to the service provider broadcast server (col. 4 lines 30-57, user STB connected to head end),
- wherein meta-data is broadcast to the one or more client systems, the meta-data including descriptions of a plurality of available for broadcast data files from the service provider broadcast server and a plurality of data files to be broadcast to one or more client system by a broadcast server of a broadcast service system that is separate from the service provider system (col. 7 lines 34-40, col. 8 lines 16-35, embedded hyperlink data, col. 5 lines 13-22, col. 7 lines 39-55, data describing programming data, col. 9 lines 20-40, plurality of program segments for viewing),
- wherein the one or more client systems rate, one or more of the plurality of data files described by the meta-data (col. 6 lines 25-52, col. 7 lines 63-67, col. 8 lines 1-11, user ratings and profile of different shows) the content rating table generated responsive to data

Art Unit: 2623

- files previously accessed (col. 5 lines 53-63, storing viewer's previous selections, col. 6 lines 2-8),
- wherein the one or more client systems transmit, to the service provider broadcast server, the ratings of the plurality of data files (col. 6 lines 40-67, sending user history and preferences to head end).
 - wherein the service provider broadcast server further broadcasts the selected data file for selective storage within the one or more client system according to respective content rating tables of the one or more client systems and prior to broadcast of the selected data file by the broadcast server of the broadcast service system.

Claim 36, Seidman (Col. 5, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 65-67; Col. 9, lines 45- 67; Col. 10, lines 1-6) in view of Brunheroto and Hite (Col. 12, lines 13-28) discloses wherein the client system selectively receive data files from the selected subset of the plurality of available for broadcast and upcoming data files according to a content rating table associated with each respective one of the one or more of client systems.

4. Claims 6-8, 12-14, 19-24, 28-29, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman et al. (US 6298482) in view of Brunheroto et al. (US 2002/0087969) and further in view of Ellis (US 2004/0226042).

Claim 6, Seidman shows a method, comprising:

- receiving meta-data, the meta-data including descriptions of a plurality of available for broadcast data files from broadcast server of a service provider system and a plurality of upcoming data files to be broadcast by a broadcast server of a broadcast service provider

- system service system (Col. 5, lines 13-32; Col. 7, lines 39-55, data describing programming data, Col. 9, lines 20-40, plurality of program segments for viewing);
- rating, in response to a content rating table, at least one of the plurality of available for broadcast and upcoming data files described by the meta-data, the content rating table generated responsive to a user (Col. 6, lines 25-52; Col. 7, lines 63-67; Col. 8, lines 1-11, user ratings and profile of different shows);
 - receiving an upcoming data file broadcast by the service provider system prior to broadcast of the upcoming data files by the broadcast service system (Col. 3, lines 55-67; Col. 8, lines 20-50; Col. 9, lines 45-67; Col. 10, lines 1-6); and

Seidman does not clearly disclose "a broadcast server of a broadcast service system that is separate from the service provider system" and "Storing, based on the content rating table, one of the upcoming data file, once broadcast by the broadcast server of the broadcast service system and the received upcoming data files broadcast by the broadcast server of the service provider system."

Brunheroto discloses an architecture of an interactive TV audience estimation and program rating in which a global tracking unit 107 is linked to a Web server 106 (Service provider system) is separate from the Interactive TV content creation 111 and the TV broadcast station 112 (a broadcast server of a broadcast service system), as shown in Fig. 1.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman with Brunheroto's interactive TV tracking architecture so that global tracking unit 107 able to determine how many people are enjoying the enhanced TV mode and showing interest in some products, even purchasing these products on the TV screen on a real-time basis based on the

hyperlinked activity which is concurrent with viewer interests on the video presentation (see page 3, §0027).

Ellis discloses "storing, based on the content rating table (ratings), one of the received available for broadcast data file (updated broadcasts) broadcast by the broadcast server of the broadcast service system (22) and the received upcoming data files (current programs in video servers) broadcast by the broadcast server of the service provider system (26) " (figs. 2 and 4; paragraphs [0041]-[0045]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman in view of Brunheroto to update the servers with future programs as taught by Ellis to add recently released programs (paragraph [0043]).

Claim 7, Seidman (col. 6, lines 40-67, sending user history and preferences to head end) in view of Brunheroto (Fig. 1 and Fig. 3) and Ellis shows transmitting the user ratings to the service provider.

Claim 8, Seidman (Col. 5, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 65-67; Col. 9, lines 45-67; Col. 10, lines 1-6) in view of Brunheroto (Fig. 1 and 2) and Ellis discloses broadcasting a service provider broadcast schedule of the subset of the plurality of available data files prior to broadcasting the subset of the plurality of available for broadcast data files to enable storage thereof by the one or more client systems.

Seidman in view of Brunheroto (Fig. 1 and 2) and Ellis further shows that a variety of hyperlinks are sent to the user, then the user selects the hyperlink, effectively sending the meta-data (Seidman col. 7 lines 28-38, col. 8 lines 19-45, selection of hyperlink sends user relevant metadata, hyperlink is effectively scheduling the display of data). Seidman further shows a (program menu" and additional data pertaining to broadcast times (col. 5 lines 13-22, col. 6 lines 65-67).

Claim 12 is analyzed with respect to claim 6.

Claim 13 is analyzed with respect to claim 7.

Claim 14 is analyzed with respect to claim 8.

Claim 19, the apparatus claim is analyzed with respect to method claim 6 in which limitations "a processor, a communication interface and storage device" are inherently met by Seidman in view of Brunheroto (Fig. 1 and 2) and Ellis so to perform as disclosed.

Claim 20, Seidman (col. 6, lines 40-67, sending user history and preferences to head end) in view of Brunheroto (Fig. 1 and 3) and Hite shows transmitting the user ratings to the service provider.

Claim 21, the apparatus claim is analyzed with respect to method claim 8.

Claim 22, the apparatus claim is analyzed with respect to method claim 12.

Claim 23, Seidman (col. 6, lines 40-67, sending user history and preferences to head end) in view of Brunheroto (Fig. 1 and Fig. 3) and Ellis shows transmitting the user ratings to the service provider.

Claim 24, the apparatus claim is analyzed with respect to method claim 14.

Claim 28, a machine-readable medium having instruction stored thereon, which when executed by a processor is analyzed with respect to method claim 6.

Claim 29, Seidman (col. 6, lines 40-67, sending user history and preferences to head end) in view of Brunheroto (Fig. 1 and Fig. 3) and Ellis further discloses transmit the ratings of the at least one of the plurality of available for broadcast and upcoming data files to the service provider system.

Claim 35, Ellis further discloses the client system selectively store data file broadcast (updated broadcasts) by the broadcast service system (22) based on the content rating table (ratings), and the receiving upcoming data files (video servers) broadcast by the service provider system (26) (figs. 2 and 4; paragraphs [0041]-[0045]).

5. Claims 11 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman et al. (US 6298482) in view of Brunheroto et al. (US 2002/0087969) and further in view of Ellis (US 2004/0226042) and further in view of Hite (US 6002393).

Claim 11, Seidman (col. 9 lines 45-67, storing overlapping segments. Although not specifically stated it is nonetheless inherent that the STB uses memory, or a digital disk to store this data) in view of Brunheroto and Hite (Fig. 5, el. 551; Col. 11, lines 40-Col.12, lines 28) further shows storing data files in memory for the user's eventual selection.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to have provided storage features as taught by Hite Seidman in view of Brunheroto to store targeted commercials so they are available at the moment needed without concern for timing on other channels (see column 12, lines 25-28).

Claim 33, Seidman (col. 9 lines 45-67, storing overlapping segments. Although not specifically stated it is nonetheless inherent that the STB uses memory, or a digital disk to store this data) in view of Brunheroto and Hite (Fig. 5, el. 551; Col. 11, lines 40-Col.12, lines 28) further disclose place each stored data file in a common repository irrespective of a content provider of the data file, such that a user can access a single location for selecting stored content data files.

6. Claim 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman et al. (US 6298482) in view of Brunheroto et al. (US 2002/0087969) and further in view of Hite et al. (US 6002393), and further in view of Brown (US 6611842).

Claim 2, Seidman (Col. 6, lines 40-67) in view of Brunheroto and Hite further shows

- receiving rating of the plurality of available for broadcast data files and the plurality of upcoming data files from the one or more client systems;
- Seidman (Col. 9, lines 20-45, 57-67; Col 10, lines 1-20, overlapping segments) further shows determining overlapping data files as data files from the selected data files to be broadcast by the broadcast service system; and
- Seidman (Col. 9, lines 10-55, displaying the program segment most relative to user interest and suppressing additional segments) further shows eliminating, from the selected data files, the overlapping data files to form a Subset of the plurality of available for broadcast data files to be broadcast to the one or more client systems by the service provider.

Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Hite does not show selecting data files from the 1st and 2nd plurality of data files, which have higher ratings, based on the received ratings.

Brown (Fig. 4-7; Col. 5, lines 20-Co1.11; lines 61) shows selecting data files from the 1st and 2nd plurality of data files which have higher ratings based on the received ratings.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman with the ability to choose segments

based on higher rating, as taught by Brown, so that user able to receive the most relevant/interest program.

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman et al. (US 6298482) in view of Brunheroto et al. (US 2002/0087969) and further in view of Hite et al. (US 6002393), and further in view of Brown (US 6611842)i and further in view of Ten Kate et al. (US 6601237).

Claim 3, Seidman (Col. 5, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 65-67; Col. 9, lines 45-67; Col. 10, lines 1-6) in view of Brown (Col. 12, lines 25-35) discloses

- broadcasting a service provider broadcast schedule of the subset of the plurality of available data files prior to broadcasting the subset of the plurality of available for broadcast data files to enable storage thereof by the one or more client systems;

Seidman in view of Brunheroto, Hite and Brown does not clearly disclose "broadcasting a broadcast schedule for the overlapping data files prior to broadcast by the broadcast service system".

Ten Kate shows broadcasting numerous amounts of schedule data pertaining to the program segments and overlapping segments (Col. 1, lines 22-36; Col. 2, lines 5-20; Col. 4, lines 50-67), program schedule data describing parameters of broadcast segments).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman in view of Brunheroto, Hite and Brown with the ability to broadcast numerous amounts of schedule data, as taught by Ten

Art Unit: 2623

Kate, so that user would be provided with the most relevant data pertaining to a program and allow the system to compare different entries.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman et al. (US 6298482) in view of Brunheroto et al. (US 2002/0087969) and further in view of Hite et al. (US 6002393), and further in view of Ballou Jr. et al. (2002/0112235).

Claim 5, Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Hite fails to show receiving compensation for a stored data file and dividing compensation between the service provider and broadcast service system based on the portion provided.

Ballou shows receiving compensation for a stored data file (page 4 section 0038, receiving ID to charge credit account) and dividing compensation between the content provider and distributor (page 6 section 0063-0064, dividing compensation between distributor and content provider).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Hite with the ability to charge per viewing and divide compensation, as taught in Ballou, so that the multiple providers would receive maximum compensation and the appropriate compensation would go to each.

9. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman et al. (US 6298482) in view of Brunheroto et al. (US 2002/0087969) and further in view

of Hite et al. (US 6002393), and further in view of Ali (2002/0199194).

Claim 27, Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Hite shows user ratings and preferences and does not clearly and specifically state that all of the users' rating are combined to form an overall ratings list.

Ali Shows combining multiple users' ratings to form an overall ratings list (page 3 section 0027, list of rated items are aggregated with the rated items from many other users into a single list).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Hite with the ability to aggregate multiple users' ratings, as shown in Ali, so that suggestions could be made to the user of recommended shows.

10. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman et al. (US 6298482) in view of Brunheroto et al. (US 2002/0087969) and further in view of Ellis (US 2004/0226042), and further in view of Barton et al (6,490,722).

Regarding Claim 30, Although Seidman shows that segments are stored and it is inherent new segments can be stored (col. 9, lines 47-Co1.10, lines 15) in view of Brunheroto and Hite (Fig. 5), the combination of Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Ellis fails to specifically state the ability to remove data files stored on a client system

Art Unit: 2623

once viewed by a user, and replace deleted data files with additional data files

broadcast by the service provider system and the broadcast service system.

Barton shows the ability to remove data files stored on a client system once viewed by a user, and replace deleted data files with additional data files broadcast by the service provider system and the broadcast service system (col. 18.lines 64- 67, col. 19 lines 1-7, deleting previously viewed segments and replacing with new segments).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Ellis with the ability to erase older segments and store new segments, as taught in Barton, so that the user would be supplied with a continuous stream of viewing material.

11. Claims 9-10, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman et al. (US 6298482) in view of Brunheroto et al. (US 2002/0087969) and further in view of Ellis (US 2004/0226042), and further in view of Ten Kate et al. (US 6601237), and further in view of Ballou Jr. et al. (2002/0112235).

Regarding Claim 9, Seidman (col. 9 lines 45-67, storing segments and user selecting appropriate segment) in view of Brunheroto and Hite shows receiving a selection for a stored data file.

Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Ellis fails to show determining the service provider.

Ten Kate shows the ability to determine information about content provider (col. 4 lines 35-67, SDT listing parameters of service for broadcast stream).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Ellis with the ability to determine the service provider, as in Ten Kate, so the system would know the source of the stream.

Seidman in view of Brunheroto, Ellis and Ten Kate fails to show billing the user a predetermined amount for selection of the stored data based on content provider information.

Ballou shows billing the user a predetermined amount for selection of the stored data based on content provider information (page 4 section 0038, receiving m to charge credit account, page 6 sections 0063-0065, billing according to multiple factors).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman in view of Brunheroto, Ellis and Ten Kate with the ability to charge per viewing, as taught by Ballou, so that the multiple providers would receive maximum compensation.

Regarding Claim 10, Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Ellis fails to show determining the service provider.

Ten Kate shows the ability to determine information about content provider (col. 4 lines 35-67, SDT listing parameters of service for broadcast stream).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman in view of Brunheroto and Ellis with the ability to determine the service provider, as in Ten Kate, so the system would know the source of the stream.

Seidman in view of Brunheroto, Ellis and Ten Kate fails to show receiving compensation for a stored data file and dividing compensation between the service provider and broadcast service system based on the portion provided.

Ballou shows receiving compensation for a stored data file (page 4 section 0038, receiving ID to charge credit account) and dividing compensation between the content provider and distributor (page 6 section 0063-0064, dividing compensation between distributor and content provider).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Seidman in view of Brunheroto, Ellis and Ten Kate with the ability to charge per viewing and divide compensation, as taught in Ballou, so that the multiple providers would receive maximum compensation and the appropriate compensation would go to each.

Claim 31, see analysis of claim 9.

Claim 32, see analysis of claim 10.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

MA

8/31/2007



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600